

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

CONCORD MUSIC GROUP, INC., ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANTHROPIC PBC,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-01092

Chief Judge Waverly D. Crenshaw, Jr.  
Magistrate Judge Alistair Newbern

**PLAINTIFFS’ MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO CHAMBER OF PROGRESS  
AND NETCHOICE, LLC’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Publishers<sup>1</sup> submit this memorandum in opposition to the Chamber of Progress and Netchoice’s (“Proposed *Amici*”) Motion for Leave to File Brief as *Amici Curiae* in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the “Motion”). No basis or need exists for an *amicus curiae* brief at this juncture, where the parties are represented by competent counsel in a case with straightforward factual and legal issues. Further, Proposed *Amici*’s proffered information is neither “useful, or otherwise necessary to the administration of justice.” *Bright v. Brookdale Senior Living, Inc.*, 2020 WL 12893860, at \*1 (M.D. Tenn. Oct. 23, 2020) (quoting *United States v. Michigan*, 940 F.2d 143, 165 (6th Cir. 1991)). Allowing this unrequested submission would serve only to increase costs and unduly delay resolution of pressing issues in this case.

Accordingly, and for the reasons discussed below, Publishers respectfully request the Court to deny Proposed *Amici*’s Motion. Should the Court grant the Motion, Publishers request the Court

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs (collectively, “Publishers”) are Concord Music Group, Inc.; Capitol CMG, Inc., Universal Music Corp., Songs of Universal, Inc., Universal Music – MGB NA LLC, Polygram Publishing, Inc., Universal Music – Z Tunes LLC; and ABKCO Music, Inc.

permit Publishers to file responsive briefing separate from their reply brief to fully respond to the arguments made by Proposed *Amici*, as courts in this Circuit routinely allow. *See, e.g., Oakland Tactical Supply, LLC v. Howell Twp.*, 2022 WL 17112202, at \*3 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 22, 2022); *United States v. City of Columbus, Ohio*, 2000 WL 1745293, at \*2 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 20, 2000).

### **ARGUMENT**

*Amici curiae* briefs may be permitted “when a party is not represented competently or is not represented at all, when the amicus has an interest in some other case that may be affected by the decision in the present case (though not enough affected to entitle the amicus to intervene and become a party in the present case), or when the amicus has unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide.” *Newcomb v. Allergy & ENT Assocs. of Middle Tennessee, P.C.*, 2013 WL 3976627, at \*1 (M.D. Tenn. Aug. 2, 2013) (quoting *Ryan v. Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n*, 125 F.3d 1062, 1063 (7th Cir. 1997)).

None of those situations are present here. First, Defendant Anthropic PBC (“Anthropic”) is represented by competent counsel who routinely represent clients with similar interests, including OpenAI, and Anthropic is fully capable of comprehensively laying out its position in the litigation.

Second, Proposed *Amici* do not have requisite “interest[s] in some other case that may be affected by the decision in the present case.” *Newcomb*, 2013 WL 3976627, at \*1. While Proposed *Amici* contend the outcome of this litigation poses “a substantial threat to the public interest in development and availability of generative AI technology,” Mot. 3, that argument ignores the ongoing irreparable harm that copyright owners are suffering from the unlicensed and unlawful use of their rights in AI. Congress already accounted for the relevant public interest by enacting and updating the Copyright Act, which gives Publishers the exclusive right to exploit their

copyrighted works and defines when, how, and on what conditions others may exploit such works. It is not lost on Publishers that the Chamber of Progress has several large members who are significant investors in Anthropic, including Amazon and Google,<sup>2</sup> and therefore have a significant financial interest in allowing the infringement to continue. Further, the Court’s decision on Publishers’ request for a preliminary injunction will not control in other pending AI cases. This litigation is no different than any other dispute that comes before and is resolved by the courts.

Finally, although Proposed *Amici* may have interest in the litigation as industry participants, advocates, and investors, they do not possess any “unique information or perspective that would help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide.” *Newcomb*, 2013 WL 3976627, at \*1. While generative AI systems may represent novel technology, the factual and legal issues presented by this case are uncomplicated. That Proposed *Amici* might extoll AI’s “substantial public benefit” does not change this straightforward case.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Publishers respectfully request that the Court deny Proposed *Amici*’s Motion. Should the Court grant the Motion, Publishers request the Court permit Publishers to file responsive briefing separate from their reply brief to fully address Proposed *Amici*’s arguments.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Partners*, CHAMBER OF PROGRESS, <https://progresschamber.org/partners/> (last visited Jan. 21, 2024); Hayden Field, *Google commits to invest \$2 billion in OpenAI competitor Anthropic*, CNBC (Oct. 27, 2023), <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/10/27/google-commits-to-invest-2-billion-in-openai-competitor-anthropic.html>; Steve Dent, *Amazon bets \$4 billion on OpenAI rival Anthropic*, ENGADGET (Sept. 25, 2023), <https://perma.cc/6UGT-9G3S>.

Dated: January 22, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Steven A. Riley

Steven A. Riley (No. 6258)  
Tim Harvey (No. 21509)  
RILEY & JACOBSON, PLC  
1906 West End Avenue  
Nashville, TN 37203  
Telephone: (615) 320-3700  
sriley@rjfirm.com  
tharvey@rjfirm.com

Matthew J. Oppenheim  
Nicholas C. Hailey  
Audrey Adu-Appiah  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)  
OPPENHEIM + ZEBRAK, LLP  
4530 Wisconsin Ave., NW, 5th Floor  
Washington, DC 20016  
Telephone: (202) 480-2999  
matt@oandzlaw.com  
nick@oandzlaw.com  
aadu-appiah@oandzlaw.com

Jennifer Pariser  
Andrew Guerra  
Timothy Chung  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)  
OPPENHEIM + ZEBRAK, LLP  
461 5th Avenue, 19th Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
Telephone: (212) 951-1156  
jpariser@oandzlaw.com  
andrew@oandzlaw.com  
tchung@oandzlaw.com

Richard S. Mandel  
Jonathan Z. King  
Richard Dannay  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)  
COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
114 West 47th Street  
New York, NY 10036-1525  
Telephone: 212-790-9200  
rsm@cjl.com  
jzk@cjl.com  
rxd@cjl.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 22, 2024, I authorized the electronic filing of the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following counsel of record:

Aubrey B. Harwell III (No. 017394)  
Nathan C. Sanders (No. 33520)  
Olivia R. Arboneaux (No. 40225)  
NEAL & HARWELL, PLC  
1201 Demonbreun Street, Suite 1000  
Nashville, TN 37203  
tharwell@nealharwell.com  
nsanders@nealharwell.com  
oarbhoneaux@nealharwell.com

Joseph R. Wetzel  
Andrew M. Gass  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
joe.wetzel@lw.com  
andrew.gass@lw.com

Allison L. Stillman  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
1271 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
alli.stillman@lw.com

Sarang V. Damle  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
sy.damle@lw.com

Kevin C. Klein  
Klein Solomon Mills, PLLC  
1322 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North  
Nashville, TN 37208  
kevin.klein@kleinpllc.com

Eric P. Tuttle  
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5100  
Seattle, WA 98104  
eric.tuttle@wsgr.com

Nicole Saad Bembridge  
NetChoice, LLC  
1401 K St. NW, Suite 502  
Washington, DC 20005  
nsaadbembridge@netchoice.org

/s/ Steven A. Riley\_\_\_\_\_